

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: BRUCE WESSON

Group Art Unit: 2821

Serial No.: 10/730,744

Examiner: ALEMU, Ephrem

Filed: 12/08/2003

Date: November 30, 2009

For: LOADED LED BULBS FOR INCANDESCENT/FLOURESCENT/NEON/XENON/  
HALOGEN BULBS REPLACEMENT IN LOAD SENSITIVE APPLICATIONS AND  
MORE

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: P02258US (98525.1P3)

\*\*\*\*\*

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES  
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sirs:

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the decision dated 30 August 2009.

Applicant believes that the Board would be correct in its assessment of claim 49 (when the second bulb is an LED bulb) if Eggers disclosed an LED bulb with a load, but Eggers does not disclose an LED bulb with a load. Rather, he discloses one or more LEDs with circuitry somewhere to alter their brightness (he simply does not disclose an LED bulb with a load).

Regardless of the patentability or not of claim 49, claims 50, 52, and 54 are believed patentable for the reasons advanced in support of claim 39. These claims are limited to LED bulbs adaptable to an application with a load/resistance to match impedance/resistance requirements of the application (not a second bulb, as claim 49 states). However, Eggers simply does not anticipate claims 39-48, 50, 52, 54, or 56-59.

Claims 39-48, 50, 52, and 54 are drawn to an LED bulb which is adaptable to an application with a load/resistance to match impedance/resistance requirements of the application (such as a turn-

signal circuit), the bulb including at least one LED and a load. Eggers, on the other hand, does not disclose an LED bulb with the required load, nor does Eggers' circuit attempt to match, mimic, or approximate the impedance/resistance requirements of an application. Eggers adds resistance and zener diode to a circuit to attempt to match LED light to incandescent light, basically making the LED light vary less with voltage (V) or current (I) changes, to simulate light "response to change" of the incandescent bulb it is replacing (col. 2, lines 7-44), primarily for use in aircraft displays so the "dim" function works properly, so as not to blind a pilot wearing night vision goggles (col. 1, lines 52-67).

Eggers teaches only "light matching" LED's to incandescent bulbs over wide V and I ranges (col. 2, lines 1-4). It teaches or anticipates nothing about matching the load resistance/impedance or current draw of the LED bulb to that of the incandescent bulb it replaces, as the present patent application does, to solve a completely different set of problems as taught in the present patent application (please see the present patent application, Summary of Invention, publication paragraphs [0035-0039]). In fact, all prior art of which the present applicant is aware, including Eggers's & Wesson's patents, teach energy efficient, low current and low heat LED Bulbs (Eggers, col.1, lines 28-34, and Wesson U.S. Patent No. 6,371,636 , Abstract, line 7 "long life, energy efficient LED Lamp" and col. 4, line 24 "improved energy efficiency" ).

It seemed that none of the LED bulb designers, not even the present applicant, anticipated inherent problems (present patent application, Summary of Invention, paragraphs [0035-0039] encountered when replacing incandescent bulbs with energy efficient, low current, low power, low heat LED bulbs; not the customers, not the dealers, not the original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) and not the infringers of Wesson's patents, anticipated that in many applications, replacing incandescent bulbs with LED bulbs would cause problems. But, because LEDs use so little current (typically 20ma each, 90ma/bulb -vs- 3.2 amps for incandescent bulbs =  $0.090:3.2 = 1:35.5$  = LEDs use 1/35th the current of incandescent bulbs = 2.8% of incandescent), most modern vehicles and equipment sees them as blown bulbs. That makes turn signal flashers "fast flash" because they

Appl. No. 10/730,744

Request for Reconsideration dated November 30, 2009

Reply to Request for Reconsideration of 30 September 2009

detect blown turn signal bulbs, cruise controls won't set because they detect blown brake light bulbs, automatic transmissions will not shift into overdrive, blown bulb indicators in the dash stay on, electronic voices announce that bulbs are blown, machinery won't start, alarms won't reset, lights flash and more.

To overcome this problem, the prior art uses separate load equalizers which are typically attached to the circuit after the LED light bulb is plugged in and a problem is detected (please see discussion at paragraph [0223] of the present patent application as published). The present invention is the first to incorporate such loads into the LED bulbs themselves.

Thus, the present invention comprises LED bulbs that are the same "load" (resistance/inductance) as the incandescent bulbs they replace, pulling the same current to trick the vehicle/equipment into sensing a functioning incandescent bulb, even though it sacrifices two important benefits, energy efficiency and low heat. The benefits of long life, reliability, vibration resistance, and brightness remain. Not one point or aspect of Eggers' patent teaches, mentions, or TELEPHONE CONFERENCE INVITATION:

Should the Examiner or any member of the Board feel that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME:

Applicant hereby petitions the Commissioner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any extension of time necessary to render this Request timely filed, and asks that the fee for any such extension be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0694.

FEES:

Please charge any fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0694.

Respectfully submitted,

/Seth M. Nehrass, # 31,281/

Seth M. Nehrass, Reg. No. 31,281

e-mail: SethNehrass@gsnn.us

Appl. No. 10/730,744

Request for Reconsideration dated November 30, 2009

Reply to Request for Reconsideration of 30 September 2009

Charles C. Garvey, Jr., Reg. No. 27,889

Gregory C. Smith, Reg. No. 29,441

Brett A. North, Reg. No. 42,040

GARVEY, SMITH, NEHRBASS & NORTH, L.L.C.

**PTO Customer No. 22920**

3838 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 3290

Metairie, LA 70002

Tel.: (504) 835-2000

Fax: 504-835-2070

[www.neworleanspatents.com](http://www.neworleanspatents.com)

P:\ClientFiles\98\985\98525\1P3\ReqRecons.wpd